

AUG 15 2006

Atty. Dkt. No. K01-003  
(formerly 0005.US00)

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 1, 22, 35, 36, 38 and 45 are currently being amended.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 5-22 and 26-38, 40-45 and 47-53 are now pending in this application.

The amendments to the claims in this reply are made to correct obvious typographical errors and to more clearly the present invention. No new matter has been added and, as will be clear from the below discussion, no claim has been amended in response to a prior-art rejection or for any reason related to patentability.

Claims 1, 5-9, 11, 12, 16, 20, 22, 26-29, 32, 33, 35-38, 40, 45, 47 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,506,393 to Ziarno (hereinafter "Ziarno I") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,519,572 to Riordan et al. (hereinafter "Riordan"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-19 and 42 for at least the following reasons.

As described in a previous reply, embodiments of the present invention relate to novel database structures and methods and systems for storing and analyzing data within a database. In one embodiment, virtual data islands are partitioned inside a database, each virtual data island containing data owned by a specific client engaged, for example, in a fundraising campaign. Data within each data island contains one or more constituent records having information about individuals, and each individual is assigned a unique identifier that is unique across the various

Atty. Dkt. No. K01-003  
(formerly 0005.US00)

data islands. A linking table of individual unique identifiers for constituent records, together with information identifying which of the data islands contain information about each constituent, may also be provided. The linking table allows database searching across islands and aids, for example, in speeding such searching.

Thus, embodiments of the present invention provide a way for data from numerous clients, such as various nonprofit organizations, to be stored such that each client can opt to share the data with other clients. To facilitate this sharing, each individual is assigned a unique identifier. As disclosed in the specification, the individuals in the database "share a common unique identifier across the various virtual data islands." Applicant has accordingly amended each of independent claims 1, 22, 35, 36, 38 and 45 to recite "the unique identifier for an individual being common across the virtual data islands."

The cited references fail to teach or suggest at least this feature of the pending claims. The Examiner argues that "a unique identifier (card account information) is inherent in" the disclosure of Ziarno I. Office Action dated 03/15/2006, page 9. The Examiner further argues that Ziarno I "implies that the organization has assigned a unique identifier to that particular individual" by keeping a running total of the contributions. Office Action dated 03/15/2006, page 10. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this interpretation of Ziarno I.

The unique identifier allegedly disclosed by Ziarno is nothing more than information related to a credit card. It is well known that individuals may own more than one credit card or that a single credit card may be associated with multiple individuals or entities. In sharp contrast, the unique identifier of the present invention uniquely identifies an individual. By way of example, the specification of the present application discloses that "John Doe" and "John E. Doe" may be assigned the same unique identifier because they "are the same person, but are using two slightly different names." Thus, while the alleged unique identifier of Ziarno identifies a credit card, it fails to uniquely identify an individual. Similarly, the running total of the contributions of Ziarno, also based on the credit card information, fails to uniquely identify an individual.

Atty. Dkt. No. K01-003  
(formerly 0005.US00)

Thus, Ziarno fails to teach or suggest at least a "unique identifier for an individual being common across the virtual data islands," as recited in each of the independent claims. Riordan is cited by the Examiner as teaching a linking table. Riordan does not teach or suggest the "unique identifier" of the present invention.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. § 2142

Since the cited references fail to teach or suggest at least one limitation of the independent claims, claims 1, 22, 35, 36, 38 and 45 are patentable. Claims 5-9, 11, 12, 16, 20, 26-29, 32, 33, 37, 40, 47 and 53 depend, either directly or indirectly, from allowable independent claims and are, therefore, patentable for at least that reason, as well as additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Claims 17, 42, 48 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziarno I in view of Riordan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,446 to Chan. Claims 10, 13-15, 41, 43, 44 and 50-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ziarno I and Riordan, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,308,201 to Pivowar et al. Claims 18, 30 and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziarno I in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,665,952 to Ziarno. Claims 19, 21 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ziarno I in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,871 to Romansky et al.

Claims 10, 13-15, 17-19, 21 and 52 depend from allowable claim 1; claims 30, 31 and 34 depend from allowable claim 22; claims 41-44 depend from allowable claim 38; and claims 48-51 depend from allowable claim 45. Thus, claims 10, 13-15, 17-19, 21, 30, 31, 34, 41-44, 48-52 are patentable for at least that reason, as well as additional patentable features when those claims are considered as a whole.

Atty. Dkt. No. K01-003  
(formerly 0005.US00)

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance.  
Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-1674. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-1674. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1674.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 15, 2006

KINTERA, INC.  
Customer Number: 27309  
Telephone: (858) 795-8915  
Facsimile: (858) 795-3010

By Sanjeev K. Dhand

Sanjeev K. Dhand  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 51,182